

JUN 1 2003

F-322  
5

## TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF

Docket No.  
SON-1905

In re Application of: **Takaharu Kitada**

Application No.	Filing Date	Examiner	Group Art Unit
09/665,667	September 20, 2000	K. Nguyen	2876

Invention: **INFORMATION PROCESSING SYSTEM, HAND HELD CELLULAR PHONE, AND INFORMATION PROCESSING METHOD**

### TO THE COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS:

Transmitted herewith in triplicate is the Appeal Brief in this application, with respect to the Notice of Appeal filed: April 11, 2003.

The fee for filing this Appeal Brief is 320.00.

Large Entity  Small Entity

A check in the amount of \_\_\_\_\_ is enclosed.

Charge the amount of the fee to Deposit Account No. 18-0013  
This sheet is submitted in duplicate.

Payment by credit card. Form PTO-2038 is attached.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 18-0013  
This sheet is submitted in duplicate.



Ronald P. Kananen

Attorney Reg. No. : 24,104

Robert S. Green

Attorney Reg. No.: 41,800

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC

1233 20th Street, N.W.

Suite 501

Washington, DC 20036

(202) 955-3750

Dated: June 11, 2003

JUN 1 2003

At 12:00 Appeal

1/13 Brief

4/9/03

Docket No.: SON-1905

(PATENT)

V. Moore

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Patent Application of:  
Takaharu Kitada

Application No.: 09/665,667

Group Art Unit: 2876

Filed: September 20, 2000

Examiner: K. Nguyen

For: INFORMATION PROCESSING SYSTEM,  
HAND HELD CELLULAR PHONE, AND  
INFORMATION PROCESSING METHOD

**APPELLANT'S BRIEF**

MS Appeal Brief - Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

This brief is in furtherance of the Notice of Appeal, filed in this case on April 11, 2003.

The fees required under § 1.17(f) and any required petition for extension of time for filing this brief and fees therefor, are dealt with in the accompanying TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF.

This brief is transmitted in triplicate.

This brief contains items under the following headings as required by 37 C.F.R. § 1.192 and M.P.E.P. § 1206:

- I. Real Party In Interest
- II. Related Appeals and Interferences
- III. Status of Claims
- IV. Status of Amendments
- V. Summary of Invention

- VI. Issues
- VII. Grouping of Claims
- VIII. Arguments
- IX. Claims Involved in the Appeal
- Appendix A Claims

## I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest for this appeal is:

Sony Corporation. An assignment of all rights in the present application to Sony Corporation was executed by the inventors and recorded by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office at **reel 011399, frame 0464**.

## II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no other appeals or interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in this appeal.

## III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

### A. Total Number of Claims in Application

There are 20 claims pending in application. Claims 1-20 stand finally rejected, and no claims are currently allowed.

Accordingly, the Appellants hereby appeal the final rejection of claims 1-20, which are presented in the Appendix.

**B. Current Status of Claims**

1. Claims canceled: None
2. Claims withdrawn from consideration but not canceled: None
3. Claims pending: 1-20
4. Claims allowed: None
5. Claims rejected: 1-20

**C. Claims On Appeal**

The claims on appeal are claims 1-20

**IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS**

An Amendment adding claim 20 was filed subsequent to the first rejection of July 30, 2002 (Paper No. 7). A subsequent final rejection was issued December 12, 2002 (Paper No. 9). No Amendment after the final rejection of December 12, 2002 (Paper No. 9) that is the subject of this Appeal was filed.

The claims in the Appendix represent the state of the claims as pending.

**V. SUMMARY OF INVENTION**

An information processing system 10 comprising: an information providing medium 1 that stores information in an electromagnetic or optical manner, the information providing medium 1 being attached to an entity 2 in order to provide information associated with the entity 2; a hand held terminal device 30 having an information read function 3 for reading said information from said information providing medium 1 in an electromagnetic or optical manner and recording the information therein 4; and an information processing unit 5 for retrieving said information recorded in said hand held terminal device 4, 30 and processing the information therein; wherein said information providing medium 1 is inconspicuously attached to the entity 2.

For example, a hand held cellular phone 401 (see Fig. 25A) for reading information from an information providing medium 1 inconspicuously attached to an entity 2, the hand held cellular phone 401 comprises: a telephone function; information read means 51 for reading information associated with said entity 2 from said inconspicuously attached information providing medium 1; and non-volatile storage means 42 for storing information read from said information read means.

In this manner, for example, a tag 1 storing information about a product 2 can be attached to the product, and a user can retrieve the stored information for use later. In the case of an advertisement referring to a web site, for example, a user can store the web address for later use. The tag for storing the information is inconspicuously attached to the entity or product.

## VI. ISSUES

The issue presented for consideration in this appeal is as follows:

- (1) Whether the Examiner erred in rejecting Claims 1-2, 6, 10, 15-16 and 18-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,193,160 to Zembitski in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,898,370 to Reymond?
- (2) Whether the Examiner erred in rejecting Claims 3 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,193,160 to Zembitski in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,898,370 to Reymond, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,367,148 to Storch et al.?
- (3) Whether the Examiner erred in rejecting Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,193,160 to Zembitski in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,898,370 to Reymond, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,959,531 to Gallagher, III et al. and U.S. Patent No. 6,012,641 to Watada?
- (4) Whether the Examiner erred in rejecting Claims 5, 7 and 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,193,160 to Zembitski in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,898,370 to Reymond, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,089,456 to Walsh et al.?
- (5) Whether the Examiner erred in rejecting Claims 8-9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Walsh et al. '456 in view of Reymond '370?
- (6) Whether the Examiner erred in rejecting Claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as

being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,193,160 to Zembitski in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,898,370 to Reymond, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,367,148 to Storch et al.?

## VII. GROUPING OF CLAIMS

For purposes of this appeal brief only, and without conceding the teachings of any prior art reference, the claims have been grouped as indicated below:

Claims 1-2, 6, 10, 15-16 and 18-19 stand or fall together with respect to the §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,193,160 to Zembitski in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,898,370 to Reymond.

Claims 3 and 17 stand or fall together with respect to the §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,193,160 to Zembitski in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,898,370 to Reymond, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,367,148 to Storch et al.

Claim 4 stands or falls alone with respect to the §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,193,160 to Zembitski in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,898,370 to Reymond, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,959,531 to Gallagher, III et al. and U.S. Patent No. 6,012,641 to Watada.

Claims 5, 7 and 11-14 stand or fall together with respect to the §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,193,160 to Zembitski in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,898,370 to Reymond, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,089,456 to Walsh et al..

Claims 8-9 stand or fall together with respect to the §103(a) over Walsh et al. '456 in view of Reymond '370.

Claim 20 stands or falls alone with respect to the §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,193,160 to Zembitski in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,898,370 to Reymond, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,367,148 to Storch et al..

In Section VIII below, Appellant has included arguments supporting the separate patentability of each claim group as required by M.P.E.P. § 1206.

### VIII. ARGUMENTS

In the Final Office Action of December 12, 2002, the following rejections were presented by the Examiner:

(i) 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 6, 10, 15-16 and 18-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,193,160 to Zembitski in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,898,370 to Reymond.

The Examiner rejected claims 3 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,193,160 to Zembitski in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,898,370 to Reymond, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,367,148 to Storch et al.

The Examiner rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,193,160 to Zembitski in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,898,370 to Reymond, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,959,531 to Gallagher, III et al. and U.S. Patent No. 6,012,641 to Watada.

The Examiner rejected claims 5, 7 and 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,193,160 to Zembitski in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,898,370 to Reymond, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,089,456 to Walsh et al.

The Examiner rejected claims 8-9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Walsh et al. '456 in view of Reymond '370.

The Examiner rejected claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,193,160 to Zembitski in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,898,370 to Reymond, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,367,148 to Storch et al.

(ii) Other

None

For at least the following reasons, Appellant submits that these rejections are both technically and legally unsound and should therefore be reversed.

(i) 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-2, 6, 10, 15-16 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,193,160 to Zembitski in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,898,370 to Reymond. Appellant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 recites an information processing system comprising: an information providing medium that stores information in an electromagnetic or optical manner, the information providing medium being attached to an entity in order to provide information associated with the entity; a hand held terminal device having an information read function for reading said information from said information providing medium in an electromagnetic or optical manner and recording the information therein; and an information processing unit for retrieving said information recorded in said hand held terminal device and processing the information therein; wherein said information providing medium is inconspicuously attached to the entity.

Claim 10 recites an information processing method comprising: inconspicuously attaching an information providing medium that stores information in an electromagnetic or optical manner to an article or material, the information providing medium providing information associated with the article or material; and reading said information from said information providing medium in an electromagnetic or optical manner and recording the information, followed by reading and processing said recorded information.

In this manner, for example, a tag storing information about a product can be attached to the product, and a user can retrieve the stored information for use later. In the case of an advertisement referring to a web site, for example, a user can store the web address for later use. The tag for storing the information is inconspicuously attached to the entity or product.

Zembitski '160 discloses a hand-held or mounted scanner 5 for reading bar codes on labels 60B. Various bar code reading devices 5 can be linked to a CPU or network accumulating data and performing analysis. See, for example, Fig. 7 and col. 13, line 64 to col. 14, line 20. Appellant notes that the bar code reader 5 is limited only to a reading device. A screen 52 is provided for displaying the scanned data or data prerecorded in the reading device 5. Data necessary for the information processing of the unit having the bar code can be stored in the scanner 5. This data can be downloaded from a central computer. See col. 9, lines 40-50.

A fundamental difference between the claimed invention and Zembitski '160 is the fact that Zembitski '160 merely reads the bar code, and associates the scanned data with information in a database.

In contrast, the claimed invention retrieves more than just an ID, but other information about the scanned object from the scanned object.

Reymond '370 is applied only for the proposition that the tag is "inconspicuously attached" to the entity.

Obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching, suggestion or incentive supporting the combination. Under section 103, teachings of references can be combined only if there is some suggestion or incentive to do so. The prior art of record fails to provide any such suggestion or incentive. ACS Hospital Systems, Inc. v. Montefiore Hospital, 732 F.2d 1572, 1577, 221 USPQ 929, 933 (Fed. Cir. 1984). In this case, there is no motivation to combine Reymond '370 with Zembitski '160, as Zembitski '160 teaches using a scanner that needs to have the label knowingly in its' line of sight. To hide the label in Zembitski '160 would in fact make Zembitski '160 inoperative. Accordingly, there is no motivation to combine these two references, and the rejection should not be sustained.

Accordingly, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the rejection of the claims should not be sustained.

Still further, "The mere fact that the prior art may be modified in the manner suggested by the Examiner does not make the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the

desirability of the modification." *In re Fritch*, 972 F.2d 1260, 23 USPQ 2d 1780 (Fed. Cir. 1992). The office action has not established that one of ordinary skill would hide the label in Zembitski '160. Accordingly, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established, and the rejection should not be sustained.

Dependent claims 2 and 6, being dependent upon claim 1, and dependent claims 15-16 and 18-19, being dependent upon claim 10, are also allowable for the reasons above. Moreover, these claims are further distinguished by the materials recited therein, particularly within the claimed combination. The rejection of these claims rejection should not be sustained.

Claims 3 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,193,160 to Zembitski in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,898,370 to Reymond, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,367,148 to Storch et al. Appellant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 3 recites the additional feature to claim 1 wherein said information processing unit is adapted to discriminate whether the information read from said hand held terminal device is genuiness or counterfeit.

Claim 17 recites the additional feature to claim 10 wherin the processing is comprised of a discrimination system for discriminating whether said commodity is genuiness or counterfeit.

It can be readily seen that claims 3 and 17 include the elements of providing information identifying the entity as genuine, as well as the information providing medium being inconspicuously attached to the entity. As discussed above, neither Zembitski '160 or Reymond '370, either alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest a system as claimed where the information providing medium is inconspicuously attached to the entity and that the information providing medium provides information identifying the entity as genuine. Accordingly, claims 3 and 17 are allowable.

Storch et al. '148 discloses or suggests that bar codes can be used to identify counterfeit products, by using numbers in the bar codes having random portions. Part of this code is accessible, another part is less accessible. Thus, the code is split between accessible and less

accessible portions that contain stored information. This duality requires that two separate "tags" be placed on an item: one on the outside of a product and one on the inside of the product that is "hidden" from normal viewing of the object. See col. 4, lines 45-51. Alternatively, only one tag is present with additional information that can be used to authenticate the product. In order for this scheme to work, the outer tag must be conspicuous, as this is the tag that would be replaced by a potential counterfeiter. Accordingly, at least one tag containing product information is in plain view, and cannot be "inconspicuously attached to the entity" as recited in the independent claim. Hiding the tag would make Storch et al. '148 inoperative. Accordingly, even if Storch et al. '148 is combined with Zembitski '160 and Reymond '370, either alone or in combination, the resulting apparatus would be inoperable. Accordingly, there is no motivation to combine the references.

Claim 3, being dependent upon claim 1, is allowable for the reasons above. Moreover, this claim is further distinguished by the materials recited therein, particularly within the claimed combination. Accordingly, the §103(a) rejection of claim 3 should not be sustained.

Claim 17, being dependent upon claim 10, is allowable for the reasons above. Moreover, this claim is further distinguished by the materials recited therein, particularly within the claimed combination. Accordingly, the §103(a) rejection of claim 17 should not be sustained..

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over by U.S. Patent No. 6,193,160 to Zembitski in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,898,370 to Reymond, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,959,531 to Gallagher, III et al. and U.S. Patent No. 6,012,641 to Watada. Appellant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 4, being dependent upon claim 1, is allowable for the reasons above. Moreover, this claim is further distinguished by the materials recited therein, particularly within the claimed combination. Accordingly, the §103(a) rejection of claim 4 should not be sustained..

Claims 5, 7 and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,193,160 to Zembitski in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,898,370 to Reymond, and

further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,089,456 to Walsh et al. Appellant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 5 and 7, being dependent upon claim 1, are allowable for the reasons above. Moreover, these claims are further distinguished by the materials recited therein, particularly within the claimed combination. Accordingly, the §103(a) rejection of claims 5 and 7 should not be sustained.

Claims 11-14, being dependent upon claim 10, are allowable for the reasons above. Moreover, these claims are further distinguished by the materials recited therein, particularly within the claimed combination. Accordingly, the §103(a) rejection of claims 11-14 should not be sustained.

Claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Walsh et al. '456 in view of Reymond '370. Appellant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 8 recites a hand held cellular phone for reading information from an information providing medium inconspicuously attached to an entity, said hand held cellular phone comprising: a telephone function; information read means for reading information associated with said entity from said inconspicuously attached information providing medium; and non-volatile storage means for storing information read from said information read means.

Walsh et al. '456 discloses a cellular telephone having a bar code reader. The telephone stores bar code information for later use. Walsh et al. '456 is directed towards bar code readers, and only bar code media is disclosed. See col. 2, line 46. Walsh et al. '456 does not disclose, teach or suggest a system including the element whereby the dataform is inconspicuously attached to the entity or product. Accordingly, at least one tag containing product information is in plain view, and is not "inconspicuously attached to the entity" as recited in the independent claim. That is, the bar code reader of Walsh et al. '456 is in sleep mode until a proximity detector identifies a possible bar code media, at which time the reader is powered up. See col. 2, lines 44-47. However, the bar code reader of Walsh et al. '456 changes state when there is reflected light from a bar code into the reader. A microprocessor, periodically awakened by a timer, looks for this changed state in order to signal the circuitry to take a reading. Thus, a bar

code must actually be in view of the bar code reader in order to sense the presence of the bar code. Accordingly, there is no motivation to attach the tag inconspicuously to the entity.

Reymond '370 is applied only for the proposition that the tag is "inconspicuously attached" to the entity.

Obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching, suggestion or incentive supporting the combination. Under section 103, teachings of references can be combined only if there is some suggestion or incentive to do so. The prior art of record fails to provide any such suggestion or incentive. ACS Hospital Systems, Inc. v. Montefiore Hospital, 732 F.2d 1572, 1577, 221 USPQ 929, 933 (Fed. Cir. 1984). In this case, there is no motivation to combine Reymond '370 with Walsh et al. '456, as Walsh et al. '456 teaches using a scanner that needs to have the label knowingly in its' line of sight. To hide the label in Walsh et al. '456 would in fact make Walsh et al. '456 inoperative. Accordingly, there is no motivation to combine these two references, and the rejection should not be sustained.

Accordingly, the Examiner has not established a prima facie case of obviousness, and the rejection of the claims should not be sustained.

Still further, "The mere fact that the prior art may be modified in the manner suggested by the Examiner does not make the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification." In re Fritch, 972 F.2d 1260, 23 USPQ 2d 1780 (Fed. Cir. 1992). The office action has not established that one of ordinary skill would hide the label in Walsh et al. '456. Accordingly, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established, and the rejection should not be sustained.

Claim 9, being dependent upon claim 8, is allowable for the reasons above. Moreover, this claim is further distinguished by the materials recited therein, particularly within the claimed combination. Accordingly, the §103(a) rejection of claim 9 should not be sustained.

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,193,160 to Zembitski in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,898,370 to Reymond, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,367,148 to Storch et al. Appellant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 20 recites an information processing system comprising: an information providing medium that stores information in an electromagnetic or optical manner, the information providing medium being attached to an entity in order to provide information identifying the entity as genuine; a hand held terminal device having an information read function for reading said information from said information providing medium in an electromagnetic or optical manner and recording the information therein; and an information processing unit for retrieving said information recorded in said hand held terminal device and determining whether the entity is genuine; wherein said information providing medium is inconspicuously attached to the entity.

It can be readily seen that claim 20 incorporates the elements of providing information identifying the entity as genuine, as well as the information providing medium being inconspicuously attached to the entity. As discussed above, neither Zembitski '160 or Reymond '370, either alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest a system as claimed where the information providing medium is inconspicuously attached to the entity and that the information providing medium provides information identifying the entity as genuine. Accordingly, claim 20 is allowable.

Storch et al. '148 discloses or suggests that bar codes can be used to identify counterfeit products, by using numbers in the bar codes having random portions. Part of this code is accessible, another part is less accessible. Thus, the code is split between accessible and less accessible portions that contain stored information. This duality requires that two separate "tags" be placed on an item: one on the outside of a product and one on the inside of the product that is "hidden" from normal viewing of the object. See col. 4, lines 45-51. Alternatively, only one tag is present with additional information that can be used to authenticate the product. In order for this scheme to work, the outer tag must be conspicuous, as this is the tag that would be replaced by a potential counterfeiter. Accordingly, at least one tag containing product information is in plain view, and cannot be "inconspicuously attached to the entity" as recited in the independent claim. Hiding the tag would make Storch et al. '148 inoperative. Accordingly, even if Storch et al. '148 is combined with Zembitski '160 and Reymond '370, either alone or in combination, the resulting apparatus would be inoperable. Accordingly, there is no motivation to combine the references.

(ii) Other

None

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing reasons, Appellant submits that the final rejection of claims 1-20 is improper and should not be sustained. Therefore, a reversal of the Final Rejection of December 12, 2002, as to claims 1-20, is respectfully requested.

## IX. CLAIMS INVOLVED IN THE APPEAL

A copy of the claims involved in the present appeal is attached hereto as Appendix A.

Dated: June 11, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By \_\_\_\_\_

Ronald R. Kananen

Registration No.: 24,104

Robert S. Green

Registration No.: 41,800

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC  
1233 20th Street, N.W.

Suite 501

Washington, DC 20036

(202) 955-3750  
Attorneys for Applicant

## APPENDIX A

**Claims Involved in the Appeal of Application Serial No. 09/665,667**

1. (previously amended) An information processing system comprising:
  - an information providing medium that stores information in an electromagnetic or optical manner, the information providing medium being attached to an entity in order to provide information associated with the entity;
  - a hand held terminal device having an information read function for reading said information from said information providing medium in an electromagnetic or optical manner and recording the information therein; and
  - an information processing unit for retrieving said information recorded in said hand held terminal device and processing the information therein;
  - wherein said information providing medium is inconspicuously attached to the entity.
2. (original) An information processing system as claimed in claim 1, wherein the information is read from said hand held terminal device, and is processed into audible type.
3. (previously amended) An information processing system as claimed in claim 1, wherein said information processing unit is adapted to discriminate whether the information read from said hand held terminal device is genuiness or counterfeit.
4. (original) An information processing system as claimed in claim 1, wherein said information providing medium comprises a film shaped substrate, an IC chip provided at said substrate in order to store information associated with said entity, and an antenna body connected to said IC chip.
5. (original) An information processing system as claimed in claim 1, wherein said hand held terminal device comprises at least an antenna body for being coupled with said information providing medium in an electromagnetic manner, information read means for reading information associated with said entity from said antenna body, and non-volatile storage means for storing said information read from said information read means.

6. (original) An information processing system as claimed in claim 1, wherein said hand held terminal device is made close to said information providing medium, thereby reading information from said information providing medium in an electromagnetic or optical manner.

7. (previously amended) An information processing system as claimed in claim 1, wherein said hand held terminal device is at least a hand held cellular phone having said information read function.

8. (previously amended) A hand held cellular phone for reading information from an information providing medium inconspicuously attached to an entity, said hand held cellular phone comprising:

a telephone function;  
information read means for reading information associated with said entity from said inconspicuously attached information providing medium; and  
non-volatile storage means for storing information read from said information read means.

9. (original) A hand held cellular phone as claimed in claim 8, wherein said information read means comprises an antenna body to be coupled with said information providing medium in an electromagnetic manner, and reads information associated with said entity from said antenna body.

10. (previously amended) An information processing method comprising:  
inconspicuously attaching an information providing medium that stores information in an electromagnetic or optical manner to an article or material, the information providing medium providing information associated with the article or material; and  
reading said information from said information providing medium in an electromagnetic or optical manner and recording the information, followed by reading and processing said recorded information.

11. (original) An information processing method as claimed in claim 19, wherein there is used a hand held terminal device comprising: at least an antenna body coupled with said information providing medium in an electromagnetic manner; information read means for reading information associated with an entity from said antenna body; and non-volatile storage means for storing said information read from said information read means.

12. (previously amended) An information processing method as claimed in claim 11, wherein said hand held terminal device is a hand held cellular phone having said information read function.

13. (original) An information processing method as claimed in claim 10, wherein there is used a hand held terminal device comprising: at least an optical sensor for reading information associated with the article from a monochrome bar code or a two-dimensional code provided at said information providing medium; and non-volatile storage means for storing said information read from said optical sensor.

14. (original) An information processing method as claimed in claim 10, wherein there is used a hand held terminal device comprising: at least a magnetic sensor for reading information associated with the article from a magnetic information sheet provided at said information providing medium; and non-volatile storage means for storing said information read from said magnetic sensor.

15. (original) An information processing method as claimed in claim 10, wherein an electronic advertising system applied to an advertising material concerning said article is constructed, the electronic advertising system providing the electronic information content associated with said advertising material.

16. (previously amended) An information processing method as claimed in claim 10, wherein a commodity selling system applied to a commodity concerning said commodity is constructed, the commodity selling system providing the electronic information content associated with said commodity.

17. (original) An information processing method as claimed in claim 10, wherein the processing is comprised of a discrimination system for discriminating whether said commodity is genuineness or counterfeit.

18. (original) An information processing method as claimed in claim 10, wherein a food information providing system applied to a food concerning said food is constructed, the food information system providing the electronic information content associated with said food.

19. (original) An information processing method as claimed in claim 10, wherein a recording medium information providing system applied to a recording medium concerning said entity is constructed, the recording medium information providing system providing the electronic information content associated with said recording medium.

20. (previously added) An information processing system comprising:  
an information providing medium that stores information in an electromagnetic or optical manner, the information providing medium being attached to an entity in order to provide information identifying the entity as genuine;

a hand held terminal device having an information read function for reading said information from said information providing medium in an electromagnetic or optical manner and recording the information therein; and

an information processing unit for retrieving said information recorded in said hand held terminal device and determining whether the entity is genuine;

wherein said information providing medium is inconspicuously attached to the entity.